

### **REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action transmitted March 22, 2007 (the "Office Action"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 7-11 and 13-21 were pending in the application. The Office Action rejects Claims 1-4, 7-11 and 13-21. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

#### **Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 1-4, 7-11 and 13-21 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-21 of co-pending applications 10/807,589 and Claims 1-21 of co-pending application 10/807,560. As these are provisional double patenting rejections, Applicants defer the decision to file a terminal disclaimer or traverse the rejections until the Examiner has indicated that the present application and co-pending applications 10/807,589 and 10/807,560 include allowable subject matter.

#### **Section 102 Rejections**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-4, 7-11 and 13-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 2003/001340 to Mosttov ("*Mosttov*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 recites wherein a set of the inputs map to commands of the application and wherein the symbol gestures are logically associated with names of the commands. Claims 9, 15 and 21 recite similar elements. Applicants previously noted that *Mosttov* states that "[t]he gestures be either simple, e.g., circular motion or shaking, or complex, e.g., tracing of letters or numbers" and that the mere disclosure that a gesture can be a circular motion, shaking, or even a letter or a number does not disclose that symbol gestures are logically associated with names of commands of an application. *Mosttov*, page 8, lines 1-2.

In response to Applicants previous arguments, the Office Action states that "Mosttov on page 8, lines 1-11 disclose an 'x-gesture' is interpreted as a keystroke 'x'. Thus, the 'x-

gesture' is logically associated with a command named 'keystroke x'." Office Action, page 10. However, *Mosttov* merely discloses that an "x-gesture" can be interpreted as a mere keystroke, keystroke "x." *Mosttov*, page 8, lines 7-8. There is no disclosure that the "x" keystroke is a command of an application or that the x-gesture may be logically associated with a command. There is no disclosure in *Mosttov* that any keystroke is a command. In fact *Mosttov* itself distinguishes between commands of an application and keystrokes. *Mosttov* states "[f]or example, one application can assign a token for a shaking motion to a command to close the application, whereas another application can assign a token for a shaking motion to data input, such as a letter or number." As evident, a command is different from assigning a gesture to a mere keystroke letter. Therefore, *Mosttov* does not disclose symbol gestures logically associated with names of commands of an application. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 9, 15 and 21 are patentable over the cited art used in the rejections and request that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 and 7-8 each depends from Claim 1, Claims 10-11 and 13-14 each depends from Claim 9 and Claims 16-20 each depends from Claim 15. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1, 9 and 15, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 2-4, 7-8, 10-11, 13-14 and 16-20 be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Chad C. Walters, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6511.

Although no fees are believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Chad C. Walters  
Reg. No. 48,022

Date: May 22, 2007

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

at Customer No. **05073**